



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/629,492	07/31/2000	Juei Chang	P3925	4269

24739 7590 01/02/2004

CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY
PO BOX 187
AROMAS, CA 95004

EXAMINER

CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

2

DATE MAILED: 01/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/629,492

Applicant(s)

CHANG ET AL.

Examiner

Joshua D Campbell

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 07/31/2000.
2. Claims 1-16 are pending in this case. Claims 1 and 10 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burson et al. (US Patent Number 6,405,245, filed on October 28, 1998).

5. Regarding independent claim 1,

- a browser application for navigating on the network;
 - Burson et al. discloses a method which includes the use of a browser application to navigate on a network (internet) (column 4, lines 36-65 of Burson et al.);
- a set of functional programs for performing tasks;
 - Burson et al. discloses a method in which processing components (functions) of a PI engine are used to perform tasks (column 4, line 66-column 5, line 21 of Burson et al.);
- a set of APIs for integrating the functional programs to the browser application;
 - Burson et al. discloses a method in which the processing components are integrated into browser functionality (column 4, lines 36-65 of Burson et al.). Burson et al. does not disclose the use of an API for integration purposes. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an API to allow an application such as a browser to operate in conjunction with separate processing components (i.e. Java applets – column 8, lines 13-45 of Burson et al.) because APIs are commonly used to provide communication between applets in Java virtual machine; and
- a control application for spawning, managing and terminating an instance of the browser application and monitoring behavior of the browser instance during a navigation sequence, such that the software-bundle functions as a fully automated navigation system capable of performing all of the functions of a

manual navigation system controlled by a user having a data-input system for controlling the navigation system;

- Burson et al. discloses a method in which a PI (personal information) engine (control application) will perform browser transactions invisible to the user (column 7, lines 30-67). The PI engine generates a simulated web client (browser instance) to perform tasks which are monitored, and when the task is completed the data is returned to the user interface of the browser application at which point the simulated web client is terminated and control is returned to the user interface (column 7, lines 30-67 of Burson et al.).

6. Regarding dependent claim 2,

- the data network is the Internet network;
 - Burson et al. discloses a method which includes the use of a browser application to navigate on the internet (column 4, lines 36-65 of Burson et al.).

7. Regarding dependent claim 3,

- the browser application utilizes the APIs and functional programs during a navigation sequence according to a machine-readable set of instructions;
 - Burson et al. discloses a method in which the processing components (programs) are integrated into browser functionality (column 4, lines 36-65 of Burson et al.). The PI that is obtained using the PI engine contains additional instructions on how to execute transactions (column 4, line 66-

column 5, line 21 of Burson et al.). Burson et al. does not disclose the use of an API for integration purposes. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an API to allow an application such as a browser to operate in conjunction with separate processing components.

8. Regarding dependent claim 4,

- the set of machine-readable instructions is provided to the bundle by the control application;
 - o Burson et al. discloses a method in which the PI engine (control application) is made of processing components (programs) to execute tasks (column 6, lines 24-65 of Burson et al.). It is inherent that a program operated by a computer is in the form of machine-readable instructions.

9. Regarding dependent claims 5 and 6,

- the set of machine-readable instructions covers a single navigation sequence;
- the set of machine-readable instructions covers a series of navigation sequences;
 - o Burson et al. discloses a method in which a user can specify what navigation sequences to perform (one or more) (column

10. Regarding dependent claims 7 and 9,

- the bundle resides on a single processor and includes an instance of the control application; and

- the software-bundle shares a control application with other like software-bundles executing on other processors;
 - Burson et al. discloses a method in which the PI engine can execute on a single processor and multiple processors (column 6, lines 24-65 of Burson et al.).

11. Regarding dependent claim 8,

- the set of machine-readable instructions is provided from an external source other than the control application;
 - Burson et al. discloses a method in which additional procedures necessary to complete a transaction may be contained within the PI store (column 4, line 66-column 5, line 21 of Burson et al.).

12. Regarding independent claim 10,

- providing a machine-readable set of instructions for initiating, running, and closing the navigation sequence;
- executing an instance of a browser application, the execution resulting from receipt of the machine-readable set of instructions;
- executing and completing a series of tasks during the navigation sequence according to the order of instruction contained in the machine-readable set of instructions;
- terminating the instance of browser application, the termination resulting from the completion of the machine-readable set of instructions by the instance of browser application;

- Burson et al. discloses a method in which a PI (personal information) engine (control application) will perform browser transactions invisible to the user (column 7, lines 30-67). The PI engine generates a simulated web client (browser instance) to perform tasks which are monitored, and when the task is completed the data is returned to the user interface of the browser application at which point the simulated web client is terminated and control is returned to the user interface (column 7, lines 30-67 of Burson et al.). Burson et al. does not disclose the use machine-readable instructions to operate the control application. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that a program, such as a control application (PI engine), operated by a computer would be in the form of machine-readable instructions.

13. Regarding dependent claim 11,

- the data network is the Internet network;
 - Burson et al. discloses a method, which includes the use of a browser application to navigate on the internet (column 4, lines 36-65 of Burson et al.).

14. Regarding dependent claim 12,

- the machine-readable set of instructions is provided by a software-control application;

- Burson et al. discloses a method in which the PI engine (control application) is made of processing components (programs) to execute tasks (column 6, lines 24-65 of Burson et al.). It is inherent that a program operated by a computer is in the form of machine-readable instructions.

15. **Regarding dependent claims 13-16,**

- navigation sequence monitored by the software-control application;
- the machine-readable set of instructions contains a first instruction for spawning an instance of the browser application;
- the machine-readable set of instructions contains a last instruction for closing an instance of the browser application;
- the browser instance is spawned by the software-control application; and
- the browser instance is terminated by the software-control application;
- Burson et al. discloses a method in which a PI (personal information) engine (control application) will perform browser transactions invisible to the user (column 7, lines 30-67). The PI engine generates a simulated web client (browser instance) to perform tasks which are monitored, and when the task is completed the data is returned to the user interface of the browser application at which point the simulated web client is terminated and control is returned to the user interface (column 7, lines 30-67 of Burson et al.).

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US Patent Number 5,842,211, by Horadan et al.

US Patent Number 6,199,079, by Gupta et al.

US Patent Number 6,317,783, by Freishtat et al.

US Patent Number 6,421,693, by Nishiyama et al.


US Patent Number 6,490,601, Markus et al.

US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0023108, by Daswani et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D Campbell whose telephone number is (703)305-5764. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 AM - 4:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (703)308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.


STEPHENS S. HORD
ATTORNEY EXAMINER

jdc
December 12, 2003

Application/Control Number: 09/629,492
Art Unit: 2178

Page 10